

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KEVIN GODINEZ MALDONADO,	)	No. C 10-1629 LHK (PR)
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER DENYING
	)	PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
v.	)	APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL;
	)	ORDER DENYING
DEPUTY JENNIFER CLAMON, et al.,	)	EXTENSION OF TIME TO
	)	RESPOND TO RULE 56
Defendants,	)	MOTION
	)	
	)	(Docket Nos. 17 and 18)

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, filed a civil rights complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against prison officials. Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Appointment of Counsel and Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to Rule 56.

Plaintiff's Motion for Appointment of Counsel (docket no. 17) is DENIED for want of exceptional circumstances. *See Rand v. Rowland*, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997); *see also Lassiter v. Dep't of Social Services*, 452 U.S. 18, 25 (1981) (there is no constitutional right to counsel in a civil case). The issues in this case are not particularly complex and Plaintiff has thus far been able to adequately present his claims. This denial is without prejudice to the Court's sua sponte appointment of counsel at a future date should the circumstances of this case warrant such appointment.

Plaintiff has also filed a Motion for Extension of Time to Respond Defendants' Rule 56 Motion, however, Defendants have not yet filed any dispositive motion. Therefore, Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time (docket no. 18) is DENIED as premature.

**United States District Court**  
For the Northern District of California

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

This order terminates docket nos. 17 and 18.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 11/11/10

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
LUCY H. KOH  
United States District Judge